



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/463,075 01/14/00 COHEN

D GENSET.020AP

HM12/0110
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SIXTEENTH FLOOR
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660

EXAMINER

SISSON, B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1655

12

DATE MAILED:

01/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/463,075

Applicant(s)

COHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley L. Sisson

Art Unit

1655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 86-121 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 106-121 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 86-105 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 86-105 in Paper No. 9, received 16 October 2000 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 106-121 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 9.

Specification

3. The use of the trademark TWEEN 20 (p. 49) has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 86-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the

Art Unit: 1655

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988). They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The Quantity of Experimentation Necessary

The quantity of experimentation needed to practice the full scope of the invention is immense; on the order of several man years with little if any reasonable expectation of success.

The Amount of Direction or Guidance Provided and The Presence or Absence of Working

Examples

The specification provides guidance for the identification of polymorphisms found in human genomic DNA through the use of BAC clones which have an insert size of from about 100 kb -200 kb.

It is noted with particularity that the claimed method is directed to the identification of "biallelic markers." Given that an "allele is one of several alternative forms of a gene occupying a given locus on a chromosome,"¹ a biallelic marker has been interpreted as being one of several alternative forms of a gene occupying a given locus on both chromosomes.

¹ Benjamin Lewin, Genes V, Oxford University Press, 1994, glossary.

The claimed method recites no method steps that would ensure that the sequence under study is that of any gene, much less a known gene, and lesser still a form of a gene found on both chromosomes.

Assuming *arguendo*, that the claims were limited to the analysis of cDNA and not genomic DNA, a point that the examiner is not sure that adequate support exists for, the claimed method is not adequately supported by the disclosure for the analysis of any sized genomic DNA fragment.

The Nature of the Invention

The claimed invention relates directly to matters of physiology and chemistry, which are inherently unpredictable and as such, require greater levels of enablement. As noted in *In re Fisher* 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA, 1970):

In cases involving predictable factors, such as that, once imagined, other embodiments can be made without difficulty and their performance characteristics predicted by resort to known scientific laws. In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved.

The State of the Prior Art

The ability to selectively identify biallelic markers in genomic DNA of any size was not well developed at the time of filing nor is it well developed even at this date.

Art Unit: 1655

The Relative Skill of Those in the Art

The relative skill of those in the art most closely associated with the claimed invention is high, on par with those that hold a Ph.D. in biochemistry.

The Breadth of Scope of the Claims

The breadth of scope of the claims is broad. As presently worded, the claims have sufficient breadth of scope so to encompass the detection of biallelic markers in any chromosome, or mixtures of chromosomes, using essentially intact chromosomes. Further, the claimed method seemingly encompasses the detection of allelic markers that occur on but one chromosome as there is no method step recited which would allow for the discrimination of allelic markers that occur on but one chromosome and not on the other.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 86-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As presently worded, the mere existence of two or more differences in a genomic nucleotide sequence between individuals is supposedly "a set of biallelic markers." However, the claimed method places no screening or determination of the presence of the alteration in nucleotide sequence with the nucleotide alteration actually occurring in any known gene. Rather than an allelic marker, it appears that the claimed method results in the identification of

polymorphisms that are not restricted to genes. Accordingly, the method of claims 86-105 is, in the very least, confusing as to what the resultant product is and how it is obtained.

8. Claims 86-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are:

- a. The determination of the occurrence of the nucleotide mutation/polymorphism in a gene and not in a intergenic sequence;
- b. How multiple biallelic markers are identified while using a heterogeneous mixture of nucleic acids;
- c. How any size of target nucleic acid can be accurately evaluated; and
- d. How common or shared sequences are resolved.

9. The term "minimally" in claim 87 is a relative term that renders the claim indefinite. The term "minimally" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

10. The term "proximity" in claims 102-105 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "proximity" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/463,075
Art Unit: 1655


Page 7

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley L. Sisson whose telephone number is (703) 308-3978. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W Gary Jones can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3592 for regular communications and (703) 308-0294 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


Bradley L. Sisson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1655

BLS
January 3, 2001